

1 [Counsel identified on signature page]
2
3
4
5
6
7
8

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

12 EOLAS TECHNOLOGIES
13 INCORPORATED,

14 Plaintiff,

15 v.
16 AMAZON.COM, INC.,

17 Defendant.

18 Case No: 3:17-cv-03022-JST-JSC

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
**[PROPOSED] ORDER SETTING
BRIEFING SCHEDULE**

1 Pursuant to the Court’s Order dated February 21, 2019 (Dkt. 497), Amazon.com, Inc.
 2 (“Amazon”) and Google LLC (“Google”) (collectively, “Defendants”) file this Proposed Order for
 3 the briefing schedule for determining an appropriate remedy related to the patent prosecution bar.
 4 The parties met and conferred, but could not agree on a briefing schedule. The competing sched-
 5 ules are in the table below:

Event	Amazon & Google Position	Eolas Position
Amazon/Google Opening Brief	April 11, 2019	April 2, 2019
Eolas Responsive Brief	May 9, 2019	April 30, 2019
Amazon/Google Reply Brief	May 30, 2019	May 9, 2019
Hearing	June 20, 2019	At Court’s earliest convenience

16 As the Court is aware, this briefing addresses what may be a case-dispositive protective
 17 order violation. Defendants’ proposal and Eolas’s proposal differ only slightly, with Defendants
 18 seeking nine extra days for briefing (not weeks or months) on an issue that has been pending for
 19 quite some time. Defendants respectfully submit that their proposed schedule is reasonable un-
 20 der the circumstances.

21 First, depositions will be complete on March 5, 2019. Defendants will then need to distill
 22 the testimony from eight depositions, and coordinate between two companies and their outside and
 23 in-house counsel, to prepare a brief that addresses this important issue. Defendants’ additional
 24 nine days versus Eolas’s proposed schedule will allow enough time for Defendants to coordinate
 25 their briefing for the Court. During discussions over the schedule, Eolas’s only reason for making
 26 Defendants’ brief due nine days earlier is that “[t]he issue has labored for two years, and needs to
 27 be brought to resolution.” Defendants too want a resolution. But there is no need to rush this

1 issue, which has had extensive discovery and battles over attorney-client privilege and work-prod-
 2 uct over many months. The nine extra days will not prejudice Eolas, whose patent has expired and
 3 requests a hearing only at the Court's convenience.

4 Second, Eolas's plan to limit Defendants to only nine days for their reply brief is unwork-
 5 able. Again, due to the need to coordinate among the Defendants and their attorneys, Defendants
 6 respectfully request the three weeks built into Defendants' schedule for a reply. Third, Defendants
 7 would like to schedule the hearing for June 20. Amazon's lead counsel, who has handled nearly
 8 every hearing with Judge Corley on this issue, is lead counsel in a case in the Southern District of
 9 California with a jury trial scheduled for May 13 through roughly May 30. Google's counsel's
 10 lead attorney handling these issues has a family conflict on June 6, and the Court is unavailable on
 11 June 13. All counsel appear to be available on June 20; Eolas did not specify any conflict when
 12 that date was suggested by Defendants.

13

14 DATED: March 1, 2019

Respectfully submitted,

15

16 By /s/ Richard G. Frenkel

 17

18

DOUGLAS E. LUMISH, Bar No. 183863
 doug.lumish@lw.com
 RICHARD G. FRENKEL, Bar No. 204133
 rick.frenkel@lw.com
 JEFFREY G. HOMRIG, Bar No. 215890
 jeff.homrig@lw.com
 NICHOLAS YU, Bar No. 298768
 nicholas.yu@latham.com
 LATHAM & WATKINS LLP
 140 Scott Drive
 Menlo Park, CA 94025
 Telephone: (650) 328-4600
 Facsimile: (650) 463-2600

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

JOSEPH H. LEE, Bar No. 248046
 joseph.lee@lw.com
 LATHAM & WATKINS LLP
 650 Town Center Drive, 20th Floor
 Costa Mesa, CA 92626-1925
 Telephone: (714) 540-1235
 Facsimile: (714) 755-8290

AMIT MAKKER, Bar No. 280747
 amit.makker@lw.com

1 LATHAM & WATKINS LLP
2 505 Montgomery Street, Suite 2000
3 San Francisco, CA 94111-6538
Telephone: (415) 395-8034
Facsimile: (415) 395-8095

4 MELISSA ARBUS SHERRY (*pro hac vice*)
melissa.sherry@lw.com
5 ELANA NIGHTINGALE DAWSON (*pro hac vice*)
elana.nightingaledawson@lw.com
6 LATHAM & WATKINS LLP
555 Eleventh Street, Suite 1000
7 Washington, DC 20004-1304
Telephone: (202) 637-2200
Facsimile: (202) 637-2201

9 JENNIFER H. DOAN (*pro hac vice*)
jdoan@haltomdoan.com
10 JOSHUA R. THANE (*pro hac vice*)
jthane@haltomdoan.com
11 J. RANDY ROESER(*pro hac vice*)
rroeser@haltomdoan.com
12 HALTOM & DOAN
6500 Summerhill Road, Suite 1000
13 Texarkana, TX 75503
Telephone: (903) 255-1000
Facsimile: (903) 255-0800

15 GRANT KINSEL, Bar No. 172407
gkinsel@perkinscoie.com
16 PERKINS COIE, LLP
1203 3rd Street, 39th Floor
17 Seattle, WA 98112
Telephone: (206)-395-316
Facsimile: (206) 359-9000

19 *Counsel for Defendant*
20 *AMAZON.COM, INC*

21 By /s/ Carl G. Anderson
22 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP
Charles K. Verhoeven (CA Bar No. 170151)
David A. Perlson (CA Bar No. 209502)
Carl G. Anderson (CA Bar No. 239927)
Michael D. Powell (CA Bar No. 202850)
Lindsay M. Cooper (CA Bar No. 287125)
Felipe Corredor (CA Bar No. 295692)
qe-eolas@quinnmanuel.com
50 California Street, 22nd Floor
26 San Francisco, CA 94111
Telephone: 415-875-6600
Facsimile: 415-875-6700

28 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP

1 Miles Freeman (CA Bar No. 299302)
2 qe-eolas@quinnmanuel.com
3 865 S. Figueroa St., 10th Floor
4 Los Angeles, CA 90017
5 Telephone: 213-443-3000
6 Fax: 213-443-3100

7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Atorneys for Defendant
GOOGLE LLC

ATTESTATION

I, Richard Frenkel, am the ECF user whose user ID and password authorized the filing of this document. Under Civil L.R. 5-1(i)(3), I attest that all signatories to this document have concurred in this filing.

DATED: March 1, 2019

/s/ *Richard G. Frenkel*

Richard G. Frenkel

[PROPOSED] ORDER

Before the Court is Plaintiff Eolas Technologies Inc.’s and Defendants Amazon.com, Inc.’s (“Amazon”) and Google LLC’s (“Google”) competing briefing schedules for determining an appropriate remedy related to the patent prosecution bar. The Court concludes that Defendants’ proposed schedule is the most reasonable and hereby ORDERS the following briefing schedule:

Event	Date
Amazon/Google Opening Brief	April 11, 2019
Eolas Responsive Brief	May 9, 2019
Amazon/Google Reply Brief	May 30, 2019
Hearing	June 20, 2019

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: _____

JON S. TIGAR
United States District Judge